

Date: Sun, 26 Dec 93 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #550
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 26 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 550

Today's Topics:

 code speed (2 msgs)
 cw speed (2 msgs)
 Let's all get together (code/nocode debates...) (2 msgs)
 License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 25 DEC 93 11:33:44 EST
From: usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: code speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

"What makes Usenet hams biased one way or the other?"

Possibly the fact that Usenet hams find time for BOTH Usenet and ham radio,
and possibly other things as well. In other words, the OFs who do nothing all
evening but hang out on 75m, yacking about how much better things were before
the FCC took 11m (not 220-222!) away, are on 75m, not here.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1993 15:20:36 GMT
From: swrindell@emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: code speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2ffuc1INNl8q@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>montp@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com (Mont Pierce) says:

>

>(in a very small extract from a long posting)

>

>>I think that all the debating that's been going on and on and
>>on about this issue [code speed for licenses] is proof that these
>>requirements are too high.

>

>I don't. I don't think you can take the postings here as being
>representative of over half a million hams. For every ham who
>complains here about the hardship of 5/13/20 wpm morse, there
>are hundreds of hams out there using morse code on the air and
>loving it. The postings here are naturally biassed towards
>those from people who feel the system is unfair to them for some
>reason. The majority of hams accept the license requirements,
>study the written and cw material, take the tests, pass them, get
>on the air and have fun, with or without using morse code.

Up until recently, hams represented a self-selected sample of the population for whom Morse was a manageable skill. Naturally they would be biased towards continuing Morse testing. *They* got in that way.

>The "debating" that goes on here is largely the output of a small
>number of people who could better spend their time learning the
>code or finding some other hobby where the requirements are more
>to their liking. We have no-code and know-code licenses now.
>Choose one or the other and enjoy.

Unfortunately for amateur radio, most of the population *has* chosen other vocations than amateur radio, and primarily because of the Morse testing. Now it's true the most people don't give a hoot about amateur radio one way or another. As far as they're concerned, hams are just the pests who mess up their TVs, and they'd like Congress and the FCC to *do something about it*. But for those who might have been interested and taken the plunge to find out what ham radio was about, many have been turned away by the Morse requirement. Now we're seeing some of those people entering as Techs. I obviously think that's very good, both for them and for the health of the service. We're still cutting them off from a major part of traditional amateur radio by denying them HF access, and by scorning them as "not real amateurs". I honestly think the latter is more of a problem than the former, the virtues of HF are oversold. But in any case,

breaking down the caste system will help more than anything else we can do. And a major part of destroying the caste system has got to be removing the baroque Morse testing requirements.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 26 Dec 1993 05:44:14 GMT
From: usc.edu!cs.utexas.edu!gerald.cc.utexas.edu!astro.as.utexas.edu!
oo7@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cw speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill, N8PKV) asks:

>oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>> The postings here are naturally biased towards
>> those from people who feel the system is unfair to them for some
>> reason.

>What makes usenet hams biased one way or the other? Or do you admit that
>hams in general feel the system is unfair? What makes usenet pro-nocode?

I said the postings are biased, not "usenet hams". All I meant was that the people who can live with the current license requirements are quietly living with them, and it's the minority who object to them who post most of the stuff in this group. The original poster to whom I was responding claimed that the mere fact that code requirements are discussed at length in this group proved that the requirements are too tough. To me, that's like saying that because creationists make a lot of noise arguing against natural evolution, it proves that creationism is right.

Of course, I can't prove any of the above quantitatively, but that has never stopped anyone from posting anything here.

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 26 Dec 1993 06:07:09 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!astro.as.utexas.edu!
oo7@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cw speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <EDELERS@delphi.com> says:

>"What makes Usenet hams biased one way or the other?"

>Possibly the fact that Usenet hams find time for BOTH Usenet
>and ham radio, and possibly other things as well. In other words,
>the OFs who do nothing all evening but hang out on 75m, yacking
>about how much better things were before the FCC took 11m (not
>220-222!) away, are on 75m, not here.

My point was that this also applies to the people who are working on upgrading, who are trying to improve their code speed, and who don't object to the current licensing structure. The people who post here tend to be those who complain about the current system. Occasionally, one of the large majority who don't object to the current system is goaded into responding.

Incidentally, if the code is the thing that is holding everyone back, why are there so many General class hams, when they could easily take the Advanced level exams and upgrade without having to take a code test? They can't all be people who made it to General only recently and are in transit to Advanced, since in many cases their licenses go back several years.

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 93 15:04:43 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Let's all get together (code/nocode debates...)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec25.034717.1@uoft02.utoledo.edu>,
<cscon0151@uoft02.utoledo.edu> wrote:

> CW has no place in ham radio today as far as I'm concerned.

OK, no-code fanatics: here's one guy who's calling for the abolition of code...

> The written part can and should be made much
> more difficult then it is now,

Sure. Let's limit ham radio to EE graduates. Run all those kids straight out of the hobby. Forget all those housewives and carpenters and bankers and English teachers and...

> and as a compromise,if CW is still kept as
> part of the exam,it should be made to have no more value than ANY OTHER PART
> of the exam!

Some compromise.

> I don't feel I should have to learn about a mode I'm NOT going to use!

Waah! Mommy, they're making me learn code!

>Anyways,I'm not writing this to piss people off

Coulda fooled me.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"A good flame is fuel to warm the soul." -- Karl Denninger

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 93 13:34:51 EST

From: usc.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Let's all get together (code/nocode debates...)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <1993Dec25.034717.1@uoft02.utoledo.edu>,
> <cscon0151@uoft02.utoledo.edu> wrote:
> > CW has no place in ham radio today as far as I'm concerned.
>
> OK, no-code fanatics: here's one guy who's calling for the abolition of code.
>
> > The written part can and should be made much
> > more difficult then it is now,
>

> Sure. Let's limit ham radio to EE graduates. Run all those kids straight out
> of the hobby. Forget all those housewives and carpenters and bankers and
> English teachers and...
>
> > and as a compromise, if CW is still kept as
> > part of the exam, it should be made to have no more value than ANY OTHER PAR
> > of the exam!
>
> Some compromise.
>
> > I don't feel I should have to learn about a mode I'm NOT going to use!
>
> Waah! Mommy, they're making me learn code!
>
> > Anyways, I'm not writing this to piss people off
>
> Coulda fooled me.

Come on guys! It's CHIRSTMAS!!!

By the way, Merry Chirstmas everyone...

73,

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear.
Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub
together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore
these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to
use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into
machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Date: Sat, 25 DEC 93 16:35:17 EST
From: usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!
noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

"No form of 'credit' for having a Class C license."

Why not? It would be better to have two "elements" if we're going to have the
two written tests, because the class A licensees need that knowledge just as
much as the entry-level licensees; with that in mind, I'd say that credit SHOULD
be given for that ELEMENT once passed.

However, I stand firm in my contention that code should NOT be required for ANY non-code privileges, regardless of frequency. It simply isn't relevant to the issue.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 93 21:46:54 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CIL6Mz.2Cu@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
>memorizing 26 simple mechanical sounds, plus some numbers and
>punctuation. You insist that memorizing over 400 theory questions
>is easy, yet insist on a test of simple sonic recall. Who's lazy?

If learning the code is so easy, why are people bitching so mightily?

The answer is simple: the folks in this group are disproportionately college-educated, and so think that they should be able to get a ham ticket using the same techniques they use to get through school. They can regurgitate answers to test questions with great ease while retaining little practical, useful knowledge.

The code is not amenable to such treatment. It's not even close to a "test of simple sonic recall"; it only yields to effort and work. Those who argue that the code should be done away with are merely trying to remove the necessity for real work for themselves; their response, "Just make the written tests harder!", would not affect them - but it would destroy the hobby for those they do not represent, by making it next to impossible for folks who aren't college-trained engineers to pass the tests.

The current licensing structure is admirably balanced: some folks have difficulty with the code, and some have difficulty with the theory. In either case, the candidate must work to achieve, and thus values the achievement more. Doing away with that would hand licenses to some folks on a silver platter, and deny them entirely to others.

I am not surprised that those who would have the licenses handed to them advocate such a change. Neither am I surprised that this forum would be

overrun with folks in that category. I hope sincerely that the FCC is not blinded by the rhetoric of laziness.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"A good flame is fuel to warm the soul." -- Karl Denninger

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1993 23:19:59 GMT

From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931220.05633.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,
<1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> In article <CIL6Mz.2Cu@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

> >It's the "wefare state mentality" of which you speak that I so strongly
> >object to, Ed. You seem to think that the FCC OWES you HF access, without
> >you doing a damn thing to earn it (and no, I don't count memorizing a
> >question pool earning it). You can talk about it until you're blue in the
> >face, but there's no way to justify laziness.

>

> Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
> memorizing 26 simple mechanical sounds, plus some numbers and
> punctuation. You insist that memorizing over 400 theory questions
> is easy, yet insist on a test of simple sonic recall. Who's lazy?

If this is so, Gary, why do so many Codeless Technicians whine, complain, and bitch about learning Morse? Simple. The "test of simple sonic recall" requires EFFORT, and those who are too fucking lazy to do this demand that this element be abolished, and the gates to HF to be opened wide for them.

--Robert

--

Kill files are an expression of resentment by the unmemorable or untalented against the memorable and talented. Your appearance in kill files merely marks the fact that you have more than once tried to make people think, when they really would rather not. It is an honor.

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1993 14:59:37 GMT

From: swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931220.05633.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,
<CIL6Mz.2Cu@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <CIL6Mz.2Cu@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

>It's the "wefare state mentality" of which you speak that I so strongly
>object to, Ed. You seem to think that the FCC OWES you HF access, without
>you doing a damn thing to earn it (and no, I don't count memorizing a
>question pool earning it). You can talk about it until you're blue in the
>face, but there's no way to justify laziness.

Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
memorizing 26 simple mechanical sounds, plus some numbers and
punctuation. You insist that memorizing over 400 theory questions
is easy, yet insist on a test of simple sonic recall. Who's lazy?

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Sat, 25 DEC 93 16:43:21 EST

From: usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!

noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CIL6Mz.2Cu@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

"Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
memorizing 26 simple nechanical sounds..."

Very well put. I never have figured out the logic of memorizing whole
question pools anyway, and I suspect that the percentage who have done it is
rather low.

However, I (unlike Robert) do make the distinction between those who simply
demand HF access without giving a reason and those who do offer good reasons
for removing the Morse barrier.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #550
